

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 4, 2004. Claims 3, 5 to 9, and 11 to 13 are in the application, of which Claims 3 and 6 are the independent claims. Claims 4 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 3, 6 and 7 have been amended, with Claims 3 and 6 having been amended, *inter alia*, to contain the subject matter of Claims 4 and 10, respectively. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended to attend to formal matters.

Claims 3 to 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,059,188 (diFazio); and Claims 6 to 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over diFazio in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,613,443 (Komatsu). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

According to one feature of the invention as recited by Claim 3, an electrode pad is disposed on at least one side of the second substrate, and the spacer is disposed on the same side on which the electrode is disposed, such that after said cutting step is effected, the spacer is disposed inwards of the electrode pad.

The applied documents are not seen to teach or suggest at least the foregoing feature.

According to one feature of the invention as recited by Claim 6, a size of the opposing substrate is adjusted according to the warp of the semiconductor substrate.

The applied documents also are not seen to teach or suggest this feature.

Komatsu discloses a gap L between his metal circuit plates 3. See Fig. 1 of Komatsu. However, the gap L is used merely as a parameter in testing and examining chip functions. See, for example, Table 5 of Komatsu. Nowhere is Komatsu seen to teach or

adjusting the size of L (by varying the size of the metal circuit plates 3) according to the warp of the ceramic substrate 2.

Applicants therefore conclude that the applied documents do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, and withdrawal of the Section 102 and 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicants note that the documents cited in paragraph 9 of the Office Action were not listed on the Form PTO-892. As such, Applicants are submitting herewith a Form PTO-1449 listing those documents. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner indicate that the documents have been considered by returning an intialled copy of the Form PTO-1449.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Attorney for Applicant  
Damond E. Vadnais  
Registration No. 52,310

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DEV/vc